REMARKS

Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that the objective and purpose of their invention is severing the dependability of a display system and an operation system. This feature is now defined in Claims 1 and 5. With the use of Applicants' invention, for example, even if a display system is shut down with an abnormal condition (it is a well known that the Web Browser sometimes shuts down with some type of trouble), an operation system can be still alive because it is worked on via another process.

According to the present invention, the preferred embodiment is that the display system is provided by the WebBrowser and the operation system is provided by another process including all the GUI objects(e.g., BUTTON, Text Input Window, Tenkey Window, etc.). These are displayed on top of the display system.

Applicants emphasize that the display system and the operation system are performed in another process, and they are unified as a whole GUI application program.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gennaro, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,742,768).

United States Patent 5,742,768 discloses a method for providing a web menu included in an applet. They are worked on in the same process with the Web Browser. By way of contrast, in the present invention, the display system(Web Browser) and the operation system are performed in another process.

The reference and the instant invention are quite different. Applicants submit that the Examiner's interpretation of the Gennaro patent is incorrect. There is no proper basis for asserting that each and every element defined in Applicants Claims 1 and 2 are disclosed in the Gennaro reference. The reference discloses certain elements found in Applicants' claims but not all elements are

disclosed. Applicants have amended Claims 1 and inherently 2, to include additional elements in the system that take their system outside the teaching of Gennaro. As presently written, Claims 1 and 2 contain elements not disclosed by Gennaro and specifically define the object controller is executed by a process separate from that used for the HTML file display controller so that if application logic is provided for the object controller, the controller can continue to provide service in the event of abnormal termination of said HTML file display controller occurs.

It is well established that a GUI system is a user interface that is based upon graphics, such as icons, pictures, menus, etc., instead of text so that the user uses a mouse as well as a keyboard as an input device. In Gennaro, et al., there is no teaching for the array GUI objects claimed by Applicant other than menu buttons. Further, in Gennaro, et al., there is no teaching with respect to severing the dependability of a display system and an operation system as is an objective of Applicant's invention.

The usual application program with GUI at this time, consists of a display system and an operation system. The display system includes characters, images, wall paper, etc. The operation system includes the business logic such as database operation and data calculations. Applicants emphasize that the objective of the present invention is to sever the dependability of a display system and an operation system.

In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, the *display system* is provided by the WebBrowser and the operation system is provided by another process including all the GUI objects (BUTTON, Text Input Window, Window, etc). The elements of the operation system are displayed on top of the display system. The display system and the operation system are unified as a whole GUI application program.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of Claims 3 - 8 and 10 - 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Fuller (U.S. Patent 5,179,653) and Smith (U.S. Patent 5,119,475).

The Smith patent (5,119,475) discloses making the framework of a menu in an object-oriented language with a rule definition file that allows users to develop custom menus for a user interface. The system disclosed is limited to the use of the menu. In Smith, it is impossible to create the whole GUI as is done by Applicants in their invention.

Applicants wish to emphasize how to sever the dependability of a display system and an operation system and make it the whole GUI application program.

The only commonality between Fuller and Smith is the generic concept that they both relate to menus. There is no basis to combine them in seeking to render obvious claim 3 - 8 and 10 - 13.

The Examiner has conceded that the Fuller reference fails to disclose the inclusion of an object definition file for function definition, wherein the object location is specified. It further fails to disclose an object window for depiction of the object on the display surface.

In analyzing the references cited, it is questionable whether the skilled artisan would look to Smith to supplement the teaching of the Fuller primary reference. Considering what the essential features of each of the inventions in these patents, the skilled artisan would not utilize Smith in support of the Fuller reference. The essential feature resides in the GUI. Fuller is limited to buttons and not a full range of GUI.

Fuller and Smith alone, or in combination, do not disclose or even imply the present invention. In the rejection, the Examiner is selectively picking and choosing individual elements disclosed in the references to the exclusion of what the references as a whole teach to one skilled in the art. For example, to arrive at Applicants' invention, the person skilled in the art would have to randomly pick and choose among a number of different elements found in Smith with the

only guidance as to what element(s) to select being provided by Applicants disclosure since Fuller does not teach Applicants' GUI. Based upon the skilled artisan's reading and knowledge of the two systems disclosed and their respective objectives and how they are implemented, it is unlikely that the person skilled in the art would use Smith in combination with Fuller.

The Examiner provides in the Official Action as "motivation" for the combination of Smith with Fuller, is given by Smith who states that "' a taxonomy of objects has been developed in an objected oriented programming environment that allows a programmer to develop custom menus for a user interface.'" (Note that Smith does not state "graphic user interface" so no inference may be drawn that "user interface" and "graphic user interface" are equivalent.)

As to Claims 5 - 8 and 10 - 12, the Smith disclosure is a general discussion of "a taxonomy of objects" that is generic and does not contain the specificity of teaching that warrants consideration. The Examiner makes an unwarranted assumption that the "user interface" and "graphic user interface"terms mentioned above are equivalent. The basis for the rejection is speculation and not proper as a viable basis for a rejection.

The references provide a "shotgun" disclosure as to the systems that are used in accordance with their invention. Considering the myriad number of systems that are disclosed in the references, the permutations and combinations of elements in the systems they set up would not render the present invention obvious.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specificities of the Smith and Fuller disclosures do not rise to the level required to qualify as appropriate references with respect to Applicant's invention.

> *Further, the reference must describe the applicant's claimed invention sufficiently to have placed a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention in possession of it.* (Citations omitted.) In re Lonnie T. Spada et al., 911 F.2d 705, 708 (Fed. Cir. 1990)

The nature of the Smith disclosure does not meet this standard.

The Examiner's obviousness rejection of the claims, for example, Claims 10 and 11 is incomplete as he has not provided the proper foundation for the rejection. A portion of the rejection of claim 10, et seq., is based upon assertions by the Examiner as to the content of the prior art. 37 C.F.R. 1.104(d)(2) states "*...When a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons...*" Applicants submit that the Examiner should comply with the excerpt of 37 CFR 104 cited above and provide the required information relating to the computer readable storage means to Applicants.

Further it is improper to rely on the teachings of Smith, (being the secondary reference) as the incentive to combine the Fuller and Smith references.

Applicants have attempted in this response to amend the claims and to place these amended claims in a form which should result in their allowability. If the Examiner wishes to discuss via telephone the substance of any of the proposed claims contained herein with the intent of putting them into an allowable form, Applicants' attorney will be glad to speak with him at a mutually agreeable time and will cooperate in any way possible. Applicants will include the limitations inserted in Claim 1 into the other independent claims if the language so included is patentable.

In view of the arguments and modifications to the claims, allowance of this case is warranted. Such favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas A. Beck
Reg. No. 20,816
26 Rockledge Lane
New Milford, CT 06776

I certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below to telefax number (703) 872-9306 addressed to: c/o Examiner Aggarwal, *Assistant Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450. Alexandria, VA 22313-1450*

Signature_____ Date: April 15, 2004

Name: Thomas A. Beck

APPENDIX A
PENDING CLAIMS

1. (Currently Amended) An interface control system which has a graphical user interface (GUI) and which accepts as the entry of commands or data, the manipulation by a user to an input screen of a display device comprising:

~~an application system for controlling an object used for input comprising a flow controller for controlling an HTML file display controller which controls the display of an HTML file via a web browser and an object controller that displays object windows that are objects used for input and which accepts various entries while performing processes corresponding to selected events;~~

an overall controller comprising a flow controller, an initial setting reader, an initial setting file, an object definition file reader, an object definition file and a page show instruction unit;

an HTML file display controller comprising a URL display instruction unit, an inter-process command transmission unit, an HTML file display instruction unit and a web browser for displaying a web page on a display device in accordance with an instruction received from, said inter-process command transmission unit;

~~said object controller including an application class operated using Java software which is provided in accordance with an object for a service;~~

an object controller comprising an application class registration unit, a page hide/show instruction unit, an object display unit, an object window, an object event controller, an event processor;

an application class comprising a page/hide preprocess, a page show preprocess, a page show postprocess (1) and a page show postprocess (2);

~~said HTML file displayed by said HTML file display controller and said object windows combine to form said input screen;~~

an input device used to enter data through operations performed in said object window;

a setting unit which sets up an initial setting filer and an object definition file;

a web browser activation unit;

said components other than said web browser being provided by an application program that runs on Java Virtual Machine;

said object controller being executed by a process separate from that used for said HTML file display controller so that if application logic is provided for said object controller, said controller can continue to provide service in the event of an occurrence of abnormal termination of said HTML file display controller.

2. (Currently Amended) The interface control system according to claim 1, wherein said screen formed using said HTML file and said object windows form a page, ~~and wherein~~ said application system manages said object using a unit page that is set in accordance with a specific entry; and wherein when said user enters a request to display another page, said application system displays objects in accordance with said unit page, and instructs said browser to change an image displayed by said browser.

3. (Currently Amended) ~~The~~ An interface control system which has a graphical user interface and which accepts as an entry, the manipulation by a user to an input screen of a display device comprising:

an object definition file for defining a function for an object used for input and a display form of said object used on said display device;

an object window on said display device in which said object, as defined by said object file, is depicted; and

an event processor by means separate from said browser for detecting an event that has occurred in response to the manipulation of said object by a user, and for performing a process corresponding to said event.

4. (Previously presented) The input device according to claim 3, wherein the location whereat said object is displayed is defined by a parameter included in said object definition file.

5. (Currently amended) ~~An~~ The interface preparation system for preparing a graphical user interface that accepts as an entry the manipulation by a user of objects included on an input screen on a display device as defined in Claim 1, comprising:

an object definition file for defining a function of an object for input and a display form for said object depicted on said display device;

an object window in which said object is depicted on said display device as is defined by said object file; and

an event processor for detecting an event that has occurred in response to the manipulation of said object by a user, and for performing a process corresponding to said event,

wherein said function of said object and the description of said display form for said object are written in said object definition file for each unit page that is prepared in accordance with a specific entry, in order to design said input screen.

6. (Previously presented) The interface preparation system according to claim 5, wherein said object definition file defines, for each object, said function and said display form of said object by using a specific format that includes information for specifying a page whereon said object is arranged, information indicating the type of said object and information concerning the location of said object.

7. (Previously presented) The interface preparation system according to claim 6, wherein said object is displayed for each page in said object window, and wherein said event processor performs a page switching process for deleting a page displayed in said object window and displaying the next page.

8. (Previously presented) The interface preparation system according to claim 7, further comprising:
a browser for displaying a predetermined image on said display device; and
overall control means for permitting the page switching process performed by said event processor to interact with the switching of a page displayed by said browser.

9. (Currently amended) A data processing system for accepting as an entry, the manipulation by a user to an input screen on a display device and for performing a corresponding process, comprising the steps of:

using a browser to display an image on said display device, and to form an input screen by combining said image and an object used for input that is controlled by a process separate from said browser;

detecting an event that has occurred as a result of the manipulation of said object by said user; and

performing a predetermined process in accordance with said detected event, and permitting said predetermined process to interact with said browser

said object used for input being executed by a process separate from that used for said browser, so that if application logic is provided for said object, said system can continue to provide service in the event of abnormal termination of said browser.